



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,036	08/31/2000	Jeffrey C. Micher	0307-0144P	4552
2292	7590	09/10/2004	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			SPOONER, LAMONT M	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			PAPER NUMBER	

2654

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/652,036

Applicant(s)

MICHER ET AL.

Examiner

Lamont M Spooner

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-97 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-97 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not identify the citizenship of each inventor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1, 7-16, 18, 20, 26-35, 37, 39, 45-53, 55 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by O'Dell (WO 00/41062 Jul. 13, 2000).

As per **claims 1, 12, 20, 32, 39, and 49**, O'Dell discloses a word prediction method comprising:

displaying at least one of selectable words and word chunks in response to receipt of an input character (Page 7 lines 30, 31, Page 9 lines 11-36, fig. 4);

receiving a selection of a displayed word or word chunk (Fig. 4 selection of WH);
and

displaying at least one of selectable words and word chunks including a selected word chunk, in response to receiving selection of a displayed word chunk (Fig. 4 "WHI")

Art Unit: 2654

"WHE" "WHA", -it is inherent to have a storage area from which word or word chunks are retrieved from, interpreted as a database).

As per **claim 7, 26 and 45**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 7 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

the input character is an alphabetic character (Page 9 lines 14-16).

As per **claim 8, 27 and 46**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 8 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

the input character includes a symbol (Fig 8 item 76).

As per **claim 9 and 28**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 9 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

the input character includes a symbol sequence (Page 17 lines 27-36, Page 18 lines 1-29).

As per **claim 10, 29, 30, and 47**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 10 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

the selection of a displayed word or word chunk is received from an input device (Fig. 1 item 2, Fig. 4, Page 4 lines 11-13-touch screen palmtop).

As per **claim 11, 31, and 48**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 11 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

the words and word chunks are in an agglutinated language (Page 17 lines 27-36, Page 18 lines 1-29).

As per **claim 13, 33, and 50**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 13 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

the selectable words and/or word chunks, displayed in response to receiving selection of a displayed word chunk, include at least one additional word chunk including the previously selected word chunk (Page 11 lines 12-25-work screens are available chunk by chunk).

As per **claim 14, 34, and 51**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 14 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

displaying, in response to receiving selection of a work chunk including the previously selected word chunk, at least one of selectable words and word chunks including the word chunk including the previously selected word chunk (Page 11 lines 12-25, Fig 7b items 64, 70, 72-chunk by chunk display).

As per **claim 15, and 52**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 15 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

storing the displayable words and word chunks in a database (Page 10 lines 25-32).

As per **claim 16, 35, and 53**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 15, upon which claim 16 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

the step of storing includes storing at least one code in association with each word and word chunk in the database (Page 9 lines 25-36-frequency codes).

As per **claim 18, 37, and 55**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 16, upon which claim 18 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

the codes include frequency codes, with words and word chunks associated with the input character and a relatively high frequency code being displayed before words

Art Unit: 2654

and word chunks associated with the input character and a relatively low frequency code (Page 9 lines 25-36).

As per **claim 57**, O'Dell discloses a word prediction method comprising:

displaying at least one of selectable words and word chunks including an input character, in response to receipt of the input character (Fig. 4, page 9 lines 11-36-page 10 lines 24); and

replacing the input character with a selected word chunk in response to receiving selection of a displayed word chunk (Fig. 4, Fig. 7a, 7b, page 9 lines 11-36-page 10 lines 24, the character "w" is replaced by a selected word chunk), wherein the selected word chunk is subsequently used in place of the input character for further word prediction (Fig. 7b-the word chunk "wh" is subsequently used for further word prediction in place of the original input character).

As per **claim 58**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 57, upon which claim 58 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

displaying at least one of the selectable words and word chunks including a selected word chunk, in response to receiving selection of the displayed word chunk (Fig. 7b-in response to receiving a selection of "wh", "which" is displayed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 3, 5, 21, 22, 24, 40, 41, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Dell in view of Mickunas (US Patent No. 5,040,113 Aug. 13, 1991).

O'Dell and Mickunas are analogous art in that they involve word predictive methods.

As per **claims 2, 3, 21, 22, 40, 41**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 2 depends. O'Dell does not explicitly disclose:

a word chunk includes a word portion used in the formation of other words and includes a predetermined identifier, identifying it as a word chunk.

the predetermined identifier is a tilde.

However, Mickunas teaches having a word chunk which includes a word portion used in the formation of other words and includes a predetermined identifier, identifying it as a word chunk (C.4.lines 18-29). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine O'Dell with Mickunas. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify any prefix to the user which will have information concatenated upon in constructing a word (C.4.lines 18-29). The examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include as one of the possible predetermined identifiers as taught, underlining, italics (C.4.lines 23-29), to include a tilde as an identifier.

As per **claims 5, 24 and 43**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 5 depends. O'Dell does not explicitly disclose:

a word chunk includes a predetermined identifier identifying it as a word chunk.

However, Mickunas teaches having a word chunk includes a predetermined identifier identifying it as a word chunk (C.4.lines 18-29). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine O'Dell with Mickunas. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify any prefix to the user which will have information concatenated upon in constructing a word (C.4.lines 18-29).

6. Claims 4, 23, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Dell.

As per **claims 4, 23, and 42** O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 4 depends. O'Dell does not explicitly disclose:

the words and word chunks are in the German language.

However, O'Dell teaches (Page 2 lines 34-36) the method is applicable to ideographic and non-ideographic languages, which includes German. The Examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to provide the word and word chunks in the German language. The motivation for doing so would have been to expand the capabilities to include particular languages for persons speaking those languages.

7. Claims 6, 17, 19, 25, 36, 38, 44, 54 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Dell in view of Kadashevich et al. (herein referred to as Kadashevich, US Patent No. 5,369,577 Nov. 29, 1994).

O'Dell and Kadashevich are analogous art in that they involve word predictive methods.

As per **claims 6, 25, and 44**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 6 depends. O'Dell does not disclose:

displaying at least one morph of a selected word in response to receiving selection of a displayed word.

However, Kadashevich teaches displaying at least one morph of a selected word (C.7.lines 9-22). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine O'Dell and Kadashevich. The motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate redundancy in the database of words, while providing all possible inflections of a word for user selection (C.4.lines 33-44).

As per **claims 17, 36 and 54**, O'Dell discloses all of the limitations of claim 16, upon which claim 17 depends. O'Dell does not disclose:

the codes include morph codes, and wherein morphs of the selected word are displayed in response to receipt of a selection of a displayed word including associated morph codes.

However, Kadashevich teaches

the codes include morph codes, and wherein morphs of the selected word are displayed in response to receipt of a selection of a displayed word including associated morph codes (C.24.lines 20-57). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to combine O'Dell with Kadashevich. The motivation for doing so would have been to make use of the codes in order to

further morphologically analyze a word properly for further possible further processing to receive a desired final result (C.17.lines 24-41).

As per **claim 19, 38, and 56**, O'Dell and Kadashevich disclose all of the limitations of claim 17, upon which claim 19 depends. O'Dell further discloses:

the codes include frequency codes, with words and word chunks associated with the input character and a relatively high frequency code being displayed before words and word chunks associated with the input character and a relatively low frequency code (page 9 lines 25-36).

8. Claims 59-97 fall within the scope the previously rejected claims, and therefore are rejected.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Masui (US Patent No. 5,959,629 Sep. 28, 1999) teaches word prediction using softkeys and displaying a selection list in response to input of a character.
- Levin (US Patent No. 4,969,097 Nov. 6, 1990, 4,760,528 Jul. 26, 1988) teaches having a character predict a prefix and selecting a prefix from a prefix list to predict a word.
- Hachamovitch et al (US Patent No. 6,377,965 filed Nov. 7, 1997) teaches using a word completion method involving symbol sequences and frequency based prioritizing of suggestions.

- Van Kleeck (US Patent No. 6,008,799 Dec. 28, 1999) teaches having a softkey entry system which allows for word prediction accounting for morphological variations of input.
- Guinan (US Patent No. 6,022,222 Feb. 8, 2000) teaches using symbol sequences in place of alphabetical sequences in order to communicate information.
- Freeman (US Patent No. 5,649,223 Jul. 15, 1997) teaches using several word predictive word sets to acquire a final desired word, including inflected and uninflected forms.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M Spooner whose telephone number is 703/305-8661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nguyen Vo can be reached on 703/308-6728. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/652,036
Art Unit: 2654

Page 11

lms
08/25/2004


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER